



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/827,301	04/20/2004	Michael B. Zemel	31894-202099	2573
26694	7590	06/15/2006	EXAMINER	
VENABLE LLP			WEBMAN, EDWARD J	
P.O. BOX 34385				
WASHINGTON, DC 20045-9998			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/827,301	ZEMEL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Edward J. Webman	1616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/29/06.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Applicant's election of diabetes mellitus in the reply filed on 3/29/06 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out any errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metz et al (AJH 1:58-60 1988).

Metz et al teach a reduction in body fat content in rats consuming higher diets of calcium (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to formulate a high calcium diet for an animal to achieve the beneficial effect of a reduction in body fat content in view of the Metz et al results.

As to the claimed reduced risk of diabetes, it is well known, even to the layman, that obesity increases the risk of diabetes, and, therefore, a method of reducing weight will reduce that risk. One of ordinary skill would further recognize that mammals in general are subject to this risk.

Applicants argue that Metz does not teach the claimed dairy products. However, one of ordinary skill, even the layman, recognizes that milk is a source of dietary calcium. Thus, it would be an obvious expedient to formulate milk as the vehicle for a high calcium diet. Applicants argue that Metz et al requires sodium in addition to calcium. However, they do not exclude sodium. As to the attached material showing beneficial effects and commercial success, such is directed to humans rather than the claimed non-human animal.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schroeder et al.

Schroeder et al teach a solid animal feed supplement containing calcium. It is poured into packages (abstract). Ruminants are disclosed (column 1 lines 50-54). As to the claimed pet food, such is merely an intended use. As to the claimed description, such a limitation is not considered patentable during prosecution of composition claims before the USPTO.

Applicants argue that Schroeder et al teach away from the claimed invention because the reference teaches weight maintenance or gain. However, that weight maintenance or gain is due to the molasses and/or fat in the composition (abstract).

Applicants do not exclude these ingredients. Applicants cite the MPEP for the proposition that printed matter functionally related to a composition can distinguish the composition over the prior art and then assert that such a functional relationship is present. However, the MPEP further states that the critical question is whether there exists any new and unobvious functional relationship between the new matter and the substrate. Applicants' instructions are a method of using which is obvious in light of Metz et al. Thus, although the asserted relationship may be present, it is obvious and, therefore, does not render the claim patentable.

Claims 1-10 rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward J. Webman whose telephone number is 571-272-0633. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, J. Richter, can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EDWARD J. WEBMAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1500